

March 12, 1975

questions about taking away individual rights to file a suit for an accident and reclaim damages. I think it is a far too broadly worded bill. If the only question is reclaiming on insurance that a person may not have been aware of at the time they filed for welfare, I think that could be done with much more precise language. So I think we ought to indefinitely postpone this and let the legal staff at the Welfare Department try and come up with much more precise language.

PRESIDENT: Senator Nichol.

SENATOR NICHOL: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, before we act hastily, perhaps this bill might have something good about it. For example, if I should be careless and run into somebody who is on welfare and damage them or injure them, perhaps me or my insurance carrier would make payments to them for their damages or for their injuries or for their medical expenses. Now, if Welfare is covering these medical expense and damages, why should my insurance company or me be paying for these damages or medical expenses and then the Welfare come in and pay them again. As taxpayers, aren't we concerned about whether a bill is paid twice. I am not saying that the bill is correctly written or too broad or too narrow but I think the bill has some merit and I would like to hear a little more from the Committee. Apparently some of them, at least, thought this bill had some merit. Just because there's subrogation doesn't need to mean that the taxpayers should pay the bill again. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Senator Kennedy.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Mr. President, fellow members, I would like to have you turn to the bill, itself, and I apologize that in answering the question a little bit ago, this bill now with the language stricken to clarify that it does only take care of the medical problem, would solve that discussion that Senator Keyes had as far as question and certainly would answer and clarify that the bill is only covering the medical problems. So in adopting the amendment that we have already adopted, this will clear that language and correct the bill. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Senator Duis.

SENATOR DUIS: Mr. President, I would oppose the motion to kill the bill because I am not sure that Senator Fowler explained what is commonly known as the art of getting money back from people and this bothers me a little bit because before too long you will probably have a no-fault insurance bill up here that also allows the matter of getting money back where other money has been paid. Now I would sincerely hope that they would just relax for just a little bit and let the bill be completely explained because in any situation where there is insurance, welfare, or anything else involved and a third party involved, I fully believe that you either do or do not have the right to collect from the other party and I didn't understand his explanation of this at all because we are mixed up in this in our particular business almost constantly and that just didn't hang together. If